

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-14 and 16-28 are currently pending. Claims 10, 13, 21, 22, 25 and 28 are amended by the present amendment.

Claim amendments find support in the specification as originally filed at least at page 9, lines 17-24. Thus, no new matter is added.

This amendment is submitted in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.116, which after final rejection permits entering of amendments, canceling claims, complying with any requirement of form expressly set forth in a previous Office Action, or presenting rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal. It is therefore respectfully requested that the present amendment be entered under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116.

Initially, Applicants respectfully note that consideration of the IDS, filed on August 9, 2005, has not been completely acknowledged. In particular, reference “NASA/CR-1998-208446...” listed under “Other References” is not indicated as having been considered. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request a copy of the PTO form 1449 filed with the IDS on August 9, 2005 having initials next to each reference.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 10-14 and 16-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph; Claims 21, 23 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; and Claims 10-14 and 16-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,112,141 to Briffe et al. (herein “Briffe”).

Regarding the rejection of Claims 10-14 and 16-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, Applicants respectfully traverse the assertion that “reconfiguring according to at least one of a size and a complexity,” as recited in Claim 19, and “reconfiguring according to both a size and a complexity,” as recited in

Claim 20 are not described in the specification. On the contrary, Applicants' specification indicates that a scale value (e.g., zoom characteristic) of a display device according to the invention may be adapted to any type of airport, "whatever its size or complexity."<sup>1</sup> Thus, the specification indicates that either a size or a complexity may be a basis for reconfiguring (i.e., at least one of a size and a complexity). Further, Applicants' specification indicates that according to the invention, "it is possible to adapt these scale values to the characteristics (size, complexity, etc.) of the airport."<sup>2</sup> In other words, the specification also indicates that scale values (e.g., zoom characteristic) may be adapted (e.g., reconfigured) to the plural characteristics, including size and complexity. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that both Claims 19 and 20 are fully supported by the written description in the specification. Further, Claim 25 is amended to more clearly recite that the display device is integrated into a portable computer, in light of comments in the outstanding Office Action.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of Claims 10-14 and 16-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, be withdrawn.

Further, regarding the rejection of Claims 10-14 and 16-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement, Claims 21 and 22 are amended to more clearly recite features of the present invention. Claim 21 finds support in the specification at least at page 11, lines 23-27, which describes how an aircraft is displayed at the center of the display screen when the map of the airport rotates and slides based on movements of the airplane, such that one of skill in the art would be enabled to make and/or use that feature. Claim 22 finds support in the specification at least at page 9, lines 17-24, describing the operation of an actuating means that cyclically displays a different predefined point of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Specification at page 9, lines 18-19.

<sup>2</sup> Specification at page 9, lines 12-14.

airport at each actuation, such that one of skill in the art would be enabled to make and/or use that feature.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of Claims 10-14 and 16-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement, also be withdrawn.

Further, regarding the rejection of Claims 10-14 and 16-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Claims 21, 25 and 28 are amended in light of comments in the outstanding Office Action.<sup>3</sup> In addition, Applicants respectfully traverse the assertion in the Office Action that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the display device” in Claim 25. However, Applicants note that Claim 25 depends on Claim 10, which recites “a single display device,” thereby properly providing antecedent basis for the display device recited in Claim 25.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of Claims 21, 23, 25 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

In addition, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 10-14 and 16-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Briffe.

Amended Claim 10 is directed to an airport display method that includes, in part, centering a view of the airport on a different one of plural predetermined portions of the airport each time a selection mechanism is activated.

In other words, the airport view is automatically centered on a different predetermined portion of the airport upon each activation of the selection mechanism.<sup>4</sup> Further, as recited in Claim 22, the different predetermined portions of the airport are displayed in a center of a window, and as recited in Claim 13, the predetermined portions are displayed in a cyclic

---

<sup>3</sup> Office Action at page 3, second to last paragraph, including comments directed to “Claim 22,” which are assumed by Applicant to refer to Claim 21, which actually includes the quoted text.

<sup>4</sup> Specification at page 9, lines 16-23.

manner. That is, a predetermined portion is displayed for a second time after each predetermined portion is displayed for a first time.

Applicants respectfully submit that Briffe does not teach each feature of the claimed invention. For example, Briffe does not teach or suggest centering a view of the airport on different airport portions each time a selection mechanism is activated. Briffe describes a method of graphically oriented aircraft display and control that includes a “continuously variable range scale adjustment without de-clutter, thus continuing to display all data items that were displayed prior to the zoom operations.”<sup>5</sup> In other words, Briffe indicates that a range scale adjustment may be made without performing a de-clutter, so that data items are not removed from the display at different scales. However, Briffe is silent regarding any selection mechanism that may be repeatedly activated to center a view on different predetermined portions of the airport. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Briffe does not teach or suggest at least “centering a view of the airport on a different one of plural predetermined portions of the airport each time a selection mechanism is activated,” as recited in independent Claim 10.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 10 and claims depending therefrom are allowable.

---

<sup>5</sup> Briffe at column 19, lines 43-44.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 10-14 and 16-28 is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Philippe J.C. Signore, Ph.D.  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 43,922

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

Zachary S. Stern  
Registration No. 54,719